

To: Tom Hagler/R9/USEPA/US@EPA[]
Cc: Bruce Herbold/R9/USEPA/US@EPA[]
From: Greg Gartrell
Sent: Tue 7/6/2010 11:29:32 PM
Subject: RE: FW: BDCP?
<http://baydeltaconservationplan.com/SteeringCommitteeLibrary/7.1.10%20BDCP%20Sizing%20Presentation.pdf>
<mailto:rdenton06@comcast.net>
ggartrell@ccwater.com

Tom and Bruce

We (CCWD) have not done water quality modeling for largely the issues you raise: not sure at this point what the assumptions should be. We are trying to get info on their water quality modeling, which is not forthcoming and from what I hear, may not be prior to release of the EIS/EIR. With that information we can judge whether this is good or bad info, but without, it is a shot in the dark and is making any decisions on a plan difficult or impossible.

Greg

From: Hagler.Tom@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Hagler.Tom@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, July 06, 2010 9:45 AM
To: Greg Gartrell
Cc: Herbold.Bruce@epamail.epa.gov
Subject: Re: FW: BDCP?

Thanks for your response.

We got that same briefing on Ron's powerpoint earlier in the week, and that's what triggered my question to Richard.

The particular issue I was concerned about was how they modeled water quality impacts (reflected on their power point starting at around slide 19). As you know, the results you get from modeling are determined by the assumptions you use going into the modeling. I have no idea whether their assumptions make sense.

Your guys (at CCWD) are usually a step or two ahead of everyone else on modeling WQ, so I was hoping that you had already figured everything out and that your results were public. But if that's not the case, no problem. I'll hand it off to Bruce and have him tell us what we think.

From:
Greg Gartrell <ggartrell@ccwater.com>

To: Tom Hagler/R9/USEPA/US@EPA

Cc: "rdenton06@comcast.net" <rdenton06@comcast.net>

Date: 07/06/2010 07:38 AM

Subject: FW: BDCP?

Tom
No need for our work now, the BDCP has confirmed it. Note that they assume 2 tunnels for the 3000 cfs case, when only 1 is required and constructing just one would reduce costs further.
Greg
<http://baydeltaconservationplan.com/SteeringCommitteeLibrary/7.1.10%20BDCP%20Sizing%20Presentation.pdf>

From: rdenton06@comcast.net [mailto:rdenton06@comcast.net]
Sent: Saturday, July 03, 2010 9:07 AM
To: Greg Gartrell
Subject: Re: BDCP?

FYI

----- Mail original -----

De: rdenton06@comcast.net
À: "Hagler Tom" <Hagler.Tom@epamail.epa.gov>
Envoyé: Vendredi 2 Juillet 2010 20:00:03
Objet: Re: BDCP?
Tom, I am in Lyon, France at the moment. The best person to ask would be Greg Gartrell ggartrell@ccwater.com
(925) 688-8100

----- Mail original -----

De: "Hagler Tom" <Hagler.Tom@epamail.epa.gov>
À: "richard denton" <rdenton06@comcast.net>
Envoyé: Mardi 29 Juin 2010 23:28:59
Objet: BDCP?

I can't remember if you are working on BDCP for CCWD (or anyone else), so if you have escaped that process, maybe you could give me a suggestion as to who would know the answer to this question:

The federal side is getting serious about defining what I think of as a preferred alternative, and is discussing the "sizing" issues.

I have a power point from maybe 6 months ago that is attributed to CCWD on this issue. I also have the PCL announcement from May 10 that explicitly references CCWD work.

What I don't have is the underlying CCWD report, if it exists and is publicly available in some form.

Do you have any idea where I might find that?